



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/009,695	11/06/2001	Mark Guy Trowbridge	DN1999119USA	1290

7590 06/09/2003

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company  
Patent and Trademark Department  
1144 East Market Street  
Akron, OH 44316-0001

EXAMINER
----------

PEZZLO, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3683

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/009,695

Applicant(s)

TROWBRIDGE, MARK GUY

Examiner

Benjamin A Pezzlo

Art Unit

3683

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

DETAILED ACTION

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, and 4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Koeske et al. (US 6250613).

Koeske et al. disclose an air spring for absorbing and transmitting shock loads between parts moveable relative to one another, the air spring including a flexible cylindrical sleeve 102 which is secured at each end to form a fluid chamber therein, a piston 94, the sleeve being secured to one end to a retainer 32 and being secured at the opposing end by the piston, the air spring being characterized by the retainer having an integrally formed intermediate ribbed reinforcement structure 10 to strengthen the retainer, allowing for direct mounting of the air spring to one of the moveable parts (see col. 4 lines 56-59), the intermediate ribbed reinforcement structure of the retainer comprising an outer plate (see col. 1 line 9: note that the spacer can be used for the bead plate 16, thus a structure congruent to outer plate 18 would be used for the bead plate side) and an inner plate 46 which are parallel to each other, and a plurality of ribs 56 that extend between the outer plate and the inner plate.

Re claim 3, Fig. 3.

Re claim 4, see ribs 82.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koeske et al.

Koeske et al. fail to disclose the characteristics of the materials which make up the retainer. Nonetheless, where the only difference between the prior art and the claims is a recitation of specific dimensions and the device having the claimed dimensions would not perform differently than the prior art device, the claimed device is not patentably distinct from the prior art device. *Gardner v. TEC Systems*, 220 USPQ 777 (Fed. Cir. 1984), See MPEP 2144.04.IV.A. Here, the claimed dimensions do not cause the claimed invention to function differently than the device disclosed by Koeske et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains at the time the invention was made to provided the device of Koeske with the claimed tensile and flex strengths in order to provide sufficient mechanical strength to the device.

Re claim 6, see col. 3 line 42.

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koeske et al. in view of Geno et al. (US 4946144).

Koeske et al. do not disclose air inlet means extending through the intermediate ribbed reinforcement structure. Geno et al. disclose a retainer including ribs (see col. 4 lines 50-58) and

Art Unit: 3683

air inlet means extending therethrough. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains at the time the invention was made to have provided the retainer of Koeske with air inlet means extending through the ribbed reinforcement structure thereof in order to provide the spring with adjustable internal pressure.

6. Claims 9-11 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koeske et al.

Koeske et al. fail to disclose the retainer being formed as a unitary article. In *In re Larson* 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965), the court ruled that providing a one-piece construction would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains at the time the invention was made to have provided the retainer of Koeske et al. as a one piece construction as a matter of obvious engineering choice.

Re claim 10, Fig. 3.

Re claim 11, see ribs 82.

Re claim 2, see ribs 56.

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 5 May 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claim 1, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the

retainer being integrally formed with the intermediate ribbed reinforcement structure) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Re claim 9, Applicant argues that the benefits of Koeske et al. would be undermined by a unitary retainer and ribbed reinforcement structure. This argument is unpersuasive because making the retainer unitary with the ribbed reinforcement structure provides benefits independently of those lost by making the ribbed reinforcement structure separate from the retainer.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 3683

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A Pezzlo whose telephone number is (703) 306-4617. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Lavinder can be reached on (703) 308-3421. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 308-3519 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

BAP  
June 4, 2003

  
JACK LAVINDER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600